Salmon and Miller/Walker Basin Planning Effort
Project Management Team Meeting

Date: Thursday December 5, 2002

Time: 9:00AM – 12:00PM

Location: City of Burien City Hall, City Manager's Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Steve Clark	City of Burien	206-248-5514
Dan Bath	City of Burien	206-439-3154
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	~~206-439-4741~~ 206-973-4723 (new phone number and address)
Bob Duffner	Port of Seattle	206-988-5528 duffner.r@portseattle.org
Bruce Bennett	King County	206-296-1952
Curt Crawford	King County	206-296-8329
Louise Kulzer	King County	206-296-1980
Julie Cairn	King County	206-296-8032
Arn Coombs	Gray and Osborne Engineers for City of Normandy Park	206-284-0860 acoombs@g-o.com
Doug Chin	King County	206-296-8315
Mason Bowles	King County	206-296-8736

Introductions and Announcements

Meeting participants introduced themselves. Curt Crawford introduced Bruce Bennett as the new Project Manager, replacing Louise Kulzer as she leaves King County. This was Louise's final PMT meeting. Two King County technical staffpersons arrived later to present the Miller and Walker Problems. Arn Coombs from Gray and Osborne Engineers was present on behalf of the City of Normandy Park.

The Agenda was reviewed.

There were no additional revisions to the 11/21/02 Meeting Summary (the second version sent out in email). The 11/21/02 Meeting Summary will be issued as FINAL.

Steve Clarke stated that the Public Involvement Strategy Meeting went well.

Schedule Update

Louise presented a mid-course schedule adjustment document, which listed project tasks and due dates in a tabular format, along with who is responsible for each task. The

Action items are highlighted

modeling tasks remain on the critical path. Overall, the work in the existing project scope should be complete by the end of 2003.

Discussion of "Latecomer" Fee

Steve Bennett from Normandy Park was not present at the meeting, but he had sent an email that he "believed $4,000 would be acceptable to our Council."

Louise reported that she had discussed the potential benefits of conducting additional field investigations in the Miller/Walker basins, if Normandy Park became a member and was able to coordinate access to areas not previously accessible. The response from the Ecology and Geology staff was that such an effort would not be beneficial because (1) information already obtained during field investigations combined with a calibrated hydrologic model would sufficiently describe the system and would be defensible, and (2) obtaining permission from property owners for access could be problematic. The technical staff are comfortable that the work completed to date is adequate to move forward in this effort.

The PMT discussed the potential benefits and uses of a latecomer fee. As discussed, the latecomer fee could have two components. The first component is to "catch-up" contributions toward the cost of work done to date. Based on the finance data available prior to that meeting, the total cost to be shared by the project partners was about $50,000. Ten percent is about $5K

The second component is "transaction costs" that would be incurred to add another Partner to the project. These tasks could include distribution of printed project materials to date, meeting or telephone time to answer questions, or a possible field trip to familiarize the new partner with previous work products and tasks. The estimate for these transaction costs is roughly $1,500.

There are also other possible ways to develop a latecomer fee. The PMT should evaluate various latecomer fee options based on the project costs to date, the final number of jurisdictions included in the project, and any other important factors.

Problem Prioritization Criteria

Julie Cairn handed out a revised Problem Prioritization Criteria ranking sheet which was modified in an attempt to incorporate the Success Criteria as the second criteria (PMT Goal Attainment) as it was applied at the last meeting. The modified second criterion was discussed. The language presented was not felt to reflect the PMT intent for this preliminary ranking, and alternate language was drafted in its place. The PMT members believed the presented language might be appropriate for ranking alternatives in the future, however, because it has an implementation focus.

Continued Ranking of Salmon Basin Problems

In reviewing the time and the agenda, the moderator asked the group how they felt about delaying the completion of the Salmon Basin problems, because King County technical

team staff were present, and one PMT member needed to leave early. The PMT agreed to this delay. See discussion of "upcoming meetings" below for more details.

Presentation of Miller and Walker Basin Problems

Mason Bowles, King County Sr. Ecologist, presented an overview of the Miller and Walker Basins. Then he presented the ecological problems from the preliminary problem list.

Doug Chin, King County Sr. Engineer, presented the Engineering, Geology, and Water Quality problems from the preliminary problem list.

Doug and Mason answered questions from the PMT, about the identified problems.

King County staff agreed to continue to refine the list of problems and organize them in a way that will be useful for the field trip, including an annotated map similar to that prepared for the Salmon field trip.

Based on the need to conduct additional preparatory work, and based on some schedule conflicts that could not be avoided, the PMT decided it makes sense to postpone the field trip, which was scheduled for December 19th.

Julie Cairn is finding out PMT and King County staff availability for the field trip, and is responsible for setting the new date.

During the presentations and follow-up discussions, several related items were discussed. They were:

Steve Clark or Dan Bath agreed to provide King County (Bruce Bennett) with a copy of the FINAL Hermes Depression Study.

Bob Duffner noted that the Port is sponsoring or involved in several pre-spawn mortality studies in the Puget Sound region. It is possible that the results from those studies may provide some clues about the pre-spawn mortality that occurs in Miller and Walker Creeks.

Dan Bath has some water quality data from Miller and Walker Creeks that may be helpful in looking at pre-spawn mortality, and the overall water quality of the creeks. Dan will give this data to Bruce Bennett.

Steve Clark has some aerial photos of the lower reaches of Miller and Walker if that would help County staff in correcting the mapping of the drainage network (piped flows versus open channel flows).

The Port is trying to decide what to do about the fish passage barrier on the STIA property (Miller Creek downstream of 160th). They would welcome any feedback that King County technical staff, or the PMT might have.

Staff from the City of Burien and King County should talk about the drainage system interfaces (actual and mapped) at 128th and East of 509, so that this area is better understood and accurately mapped.

Action items are highlighted

King County staff should check the mapping for the wetlands at the temporary interchange of 509 to 176th. These may be missing.

There are 2 small stormwater ponds on the West side of 509, which do not appear to be being maintained. There is some question as to who owns these (WSDOT?). The ownership of these should be investigated.

Bob Duffner will provide Bruce Bennett with a copy of the 509 Temporary Interchange Study (done by HNTB for the Port and WSDOT). The 2 small stormwater ponds may be identified in that report.

Upcoming Meetings and Agenda Items

December 19, 2002 Miller/Walker Field Trip **CANCELLED**

January 9, 2003 PMT Meeting from 9AM – Noon (we can adjourn early if we're done) **(**This is the 2nd Thursday instead of the 1st Thursday)

Complete Salmon Basin Problem Ranking

Late January or Early February Miller/Walker Field Trip with PMT

February 6, 2003 PMT Meeting from 9AM – Noon

Discuss Miller and Walker Problems (local vs. shared, and ranking)

March 6, 2003 PMT Meeting from 9AM – Noon

Continue discussion and ranking of Miller and Walker Problems

Related Attachments (double click icon to open file)

Updated PMT Roster	120502PMTAtt01
FINAL 11/21/02 Meeting Summary	
Problem Prioritization Criteria (modified based on meeting discussion)	120502PMTAtt03

Parking Lot Items

- FAA prohibits the creation of "wildlife attraction hazards." This means that proposed solutions near the airport need to consider and address this requirement.
- Will the future conditions model run incorporate redevelopment of Park Lake Homes, and a potentially upsized pump station at Lake Garrett.
- Does/will the model of Miller and Walker Creeks incorporate the drainage flows along 509?

Action items are highlighted

Miller/Salmon Creek Basin Planning Effort Contact Information (updated 12/11/02)

Name	Organization	Phone	Mailing Address	Email
Steve Clark	City of Burien	(206) 248-5514	Public Works Director City of Burien 415 SW 150th Burien WA 98166	stephenc@ci.burien.wa.us
Dan Bath	City of Burien	(206) 439-3154	(Same as Steve?) City of Burien 415 SW 150th Burien WA 98166	danb@ci.burien.wa.us
Don Monaghan	City of SeaTac	(206) 439-4716	(Same as Dale?) Public Works Director 4800 S. 188th St. SeaTac 98188	donald@seatac.wa.gov
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	(206) 241-1996	City of SeaTac 4800 S. 188th St. SeaTac 98188	dales@seatac.wa.gov
Curt Crawford	King County	(206) 296-8329	201 S Jackson Suite 600 Seattle, WA 98104-3855	curt.crawford@metrokc.gov
Bob Duffner	Port of Seattle	206-988-5528	17900 International Boulevard Suite 301 SeaTac, WA 98188-4980	duffner.r@portseattle.org
Carol Hunter	WSDOT	(206) 464-1219	401 2nd Ave South #550 Seattle, WA 98104-2447	hunterc@wsdot.wa.gov
Steve Bennett	Normandy Park	(206) 248-7603	801 SW 174th Street Normandy Park, WA 98166-3661	steveb@ci.normandy-park.wa.us
Bruce Bennett	King County, Project Manager	(206) 296-1952	201 S Jackson Suite 700 Seattle, WA 98104-3855	bruce.bennett@metrokc.gov
Julie Cairn	Facilitator	(206) 296-8032	201 S Jackson Suite 600 Seattle, WA 98104-3855	julie.cairn@metrokc.gov
Doug Chin	King County, Project Engineer	(206) 296-8315	201 S Jackson Suite 600 Seattle, WA 98104-3855	doug.chin@metrokc.gov

Problem Prioritization Criteria

(Modeled after Section 3.8 of Des Moines Creek Basin Plan)

Revised based on feedback at the 12/5/02 PMT Meeting

Steps

1. Take the list of identified problems
2. Classify the problems as Local or Shared/Joint
3. Apply points to each problem based on the Prioritization Criteria below.
4. Categorize problems as High, Moderate, or Low priority based on the total number of points.
5. The PMT agrees on the prioritized list.
6. The PMT gives the prioritized list to the technical team to further focus their analysis and recommendations.

Description of Prioritization Criteria

Significance/Impact to Ecological Systems: For a stream system and its associated ecological resources to work, a number of physical and biological forces must be roughly in balance. Some problems pose a much greater risk to the balance than others do. The environmental significance of the problem to the overall health of the ecological system was used as a key criterion.

Points	Meaning
0	The problem has little significance on the overall system ecology
50	The problem impacts the ecological system
100	The problem has the capability to undermine the ecological health of the system

Consistency with the Project Success Criteria: To what extend does solving the problem support the project success criteria/goals of:

- improving fish and other aquatic habitat
- improving infrastructure capacity and reducing flooding
- improving water quality

Points	Meaning
0	Addressing this problem only minimally supports the project goals/success criteria
50	Addressing this problem supports some of the project goals/success criteria
100	Addressing this problem significantly supports the project goals/success criteria

Threatens Significant Infrastructure: Several substantial investments in infrastructure already exist within the basins, and are potentially impacted by the stream system and related ecological resources. Infrastructure consists of stormwater and wastewater pipelines, bridges and culverts, buildings or other structures, or resources of significance.

Points	Meaning
0	The problem does not threaten infrastructure
50	The problem poses some threat to infrastructure
100	The problem definitely poses a substantial threat to a significant piece of infrastructure

Problem Categorization and Interpretation:

Total Points	Categorization of Priority
125 – 200 (or higher)	High Priority
75 – 124	Moderate Priority
0 – 74	Low Priority

A problem with a score of 300 represents a problem that significantly threatens the ecological system and surrounding infrastructure, AND addressing it significantly supports the project goals/success criteria.

A problem with a low score does not represent a significant threat to the ecology or the infrastructure, OR addressing it only minimally supports the project goals/success criteria.